

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/623,574	Applicant(s) MAYER ET AL.	
	Examiner Edward M. Johnson	Art Unit 1754	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Edward M. Johnson. (3)_____.

(2) Tarik Nabi. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 19 May 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all pending.

Identification of prior art discussed: Popp '950; Fox '769.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant asserted that there was no suggestion of a high purity salt in the cited references and no evaporative process is disclosed. The Examiner suggested that either a recitation of an evaporative process in the body of the claim or a more specific recitation of "high" purity could overcome the rejection.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required